

Accompanying this paper is a form PTO-1449 citing references that the examiner may find relevant to the pending claims. Two of the references cited therein were relied upon in the parent case to reject the pending claims. The applicants have chosen to respond to these rejections below to assist the examiner in the present case.

In paper no. 9 of the parent case, the examiner suggested that minor amendments to the claims would “read over the art of record,” (see, page 3) and presumably, therefore, place the claims in condition for allowance. While the applicants noted this promising indication, no amendments were made, as it was apparent that the rejections of these claims were improper and should have been removed.

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 were rejected in the parent case based on Clark, which, per the examiner, taught a first panel, a second panel, and first and second seals engaging one another in the closed position. The rejection was improper.

Though the examiner identified some claim recitations as purportedly being taught by Clark, the examiner failed to identify structure in Clark that corresponded to each and every limitation found in the claim as is required in making an anticipation rejection. For example, the examiner identified nothing that showed “the second distal end between the first distal end and at least one of the first door panel and the first attachment end,” as recited in claims 1-2 and 4-11. As the examiner made no mention of this, or other recitations from these claims, the rejection based on Clark was improper.

The examiner in the parent case also rejected independent claim 15 as being anticipated by Clark, stating that the reference taught a first panel and first and second seals that engage one another in the closed position. As with above-mentioned Clark rejection, the examiner’s rejection was improper as the examiner failed to point to structure showing all claimed elements. The examiner pointed to nothing in Clark as showing “a second seal in sliding relationship with the first seal *and* having a second sealing surface *facing the first*

sealing surface when the first door panel is in the doorway blocking position” as called for in claim 15 (emphasis added), and, therefore, the rejection was improper.

The examiner also rejected claims 28-29 as being anticipated by a second reference, Saucier. The rejection stated that Saucier taught a plurality of panels having front and rear panel sealing elements. As an initial matter, claims 28-29 are directed to a structure having a first *corner* seal and a second *corner* seal. The rejection not being directed to such claim elements was improper. Furthermore, though the rejection states that while one panel is moved a rear portion sealingly engages a front portion, the examiner failed to recognize the recitation in claim 28 that the second corner seal has a “second sealing surface that creates an *L-shaped pattern of contact* with the first sealing surface” when the first door panel is in the doorway blocking position. As no structure showing such a feature was identified by the examiner, the rejection of claims 28-29 was improper.

The applicants respectfully assert that, not only were these rejections improper, the pending claims, in fact, read over the prior art and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. Favorable treatment thereof is respectfully requested. If the examiner would like to discuss this case, please feel free to contact the below signed representative.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "PAUL", written over a horizontal line.

Paul B. Stephens
Reg. No. 47,970
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 474-6300

January 23, 2002